

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-11 stand rejected and are presently pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration in view of the following remarks is earnestly solicited.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Asgharian et al.:

The Office Action dated October 13, 2009 rejects claims 1-4 and 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asgharian et al. (U.S. 6,139,646) indicating that Asgharian et al. teaches the use of a simple saccharide in a composition that contains PHMB. In light of the following remarks and the declaration of Mr. Ed Jahngen, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The instant claims relate to an ophthalmic solution and a method of applying the solution in which the solution is physiologically compatible with direct contact with corneal eye tissue. When utilizing a solution that comes in direct contact with the eye, it is important to ensure that none of the components of the solution would provide any adverse effects.

Enzyme solutions, such as those taught by Asgharian et al., are often used to digest protein build up on contact lenses. The enzymes digest the protein and therefore remove the build up on the lens. However, enzyme solutions would be detrimental if they came in direct contact with the eye. The enzyme would digest the proteins naturally found in the eye causing severe adverse effects. Therefore, it is important to properly rinse and then disinfect contact lenses after using an enzyme solution prior to returning the contact lens to the eye.

Asgharian et al. explicitly recites a liquid enzyme composition (abstract) for cleaning a contact lens. However, this enzyme composition would not be suitable for direct eye contact as enzyme solutions are known to those skilled in the art to be harmful to the eye. Applicant kindly directs the Examiner's attention to Exhibit 1, the declaration of Mr. Ed Jahngen, filed under 37 C.F.R. §132 ("Declaration"), indicating that enzyme solutions, such as those disclosed by Asgharian et al. are not suitable for in-eye applications. Declaration, Para. 9. The Declaration indicates that enzyme solutions are

used to digest protein build up on contact lenses, and if the enzyme solution where to come in direct contact with the eye the solution would digest the proteins naturally found in the eye thereby causing adverse effects. Declaration, Paras 5 – 6.

Regarding the indication that Asgharian et al. teaches a solution that is suitable for direct contact with corneal tissue, Col. 9, Lns. 61 – 63 indicate that the multi-purpose composition is intended to function as storing, rinsing, cleaning and disinfecting solutions. Asgharian et al. is silent regarding direct contact with corneal tissue. Because of the dangers of enzyme solutions, it is imperative to rinse any remaining enzyme solution away from a contact lens prior to placing the lens in contact with an eye. Declaration, Para. 7. Although enzyme solutions, such as those disclosed by Asgharian et al., may be physiologically compatible as storing, rinsing, cleaning and disinfecting solutions, enzyme solutions are not suitable for direct contact with corneal tissue as claimed. It is understood that even in the applied functions of storing, rinsing, cleaning and disinfecting, such enzyme solutions would be rinsed away prior to placing a contact lens in contact with an eye to prevent the enzyme from digesting the healthy proteins naturally found in the eye.

As the instant claims recite a solution that is physiologically compatible with direct contact with corneal tissue, and, as evidenced by the Declaration, enzyme solutions are not suitable for in-eye applications, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 8, 9, 11 and all claims that depend therefrom are therefore in condition for allowance.

Applicant appreciates the opportunity to call the Examiner but believes that the forgoing remarks fully address the issues raised by the Examiner. On the other hand, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney if he has any matters to address that will facilitate allowance of the application.

In the event that Applicant has overlooked the need for an extension of time, additional extension of time, payment of fee, or additional payment of fee, Applicant

Appl. No. 10/544,151
Resp. Dated April 12, 2010
Reply to Office Action of October 13, 2009

hereby conditionally petitions therefore and authorizes that any changes be made to
Deposit Account No.: 50-3010.

Respectfully submitted,

HISCOCK & BARCLAY, LLP

By:

Jason R. Womer
Reg. No. 60,149
2000 HSBC Plaza
100 Chestnut Street
Rochester, NY 14604
Tel: (585) 295-4400 x4306
Fax: (585) 295-8431